

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 9, and 15 are independent claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 4-8 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 9-14 are allowed.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("APA") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003-0151565 of Kim, *et al.* ("Kim"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. The motivation to modify the prior art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based upon a patent applicant's disclosure. See *in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness at least because there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the reference teachings in the manner the Office Action suggests. The Office Action seeks to cure the deficiencies of APA by relying upon the teachings of Kim. However, the APA relied upon by the examiner relates to an organic EL image display apparatus (see specification, page 2, lines 9-17), and Kim relates to a plasma display panel (PDP) driving apparatus (Kim's Figure 32 illustrates a PDP driving device;

paragraph [0150]). While an organic EL image display apparatus and a PDP both display images, they do so utilizing different structures, and they operate on different principles.

Therefore, for this reason alone, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the organic EL display taught by APA with the PDP driving device taught by Kim.

Furthermore, the Office Action's purported motivation to combine APA with Kim can not support a prima facie case of obviousness. The Office Action states that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the gamma correction, as taught by Kim in the device of APA, so that the brightness is enhanced much more to thereby prevent a deterioration of the image at low gray level" (Office Action, page 3; emphasis added). Applicants, however, were confronting the problem of a display screen having a large brightness difference caused by a large difference in the number of pixels that were ON and OFF. Applicants respectfully submit that the purported motivation of combining Kim and APA (i.e. to enhance brightness) would serve to exacerbate this problem. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine APA and Kim in the manner the Office Action proposes.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 15. Claims 2-3 and 16-18 depend from claims 1 or 15 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 15, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 9-14 are allowed.

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 4-8 contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 4-8 have not been amended because Applicants respectfully submit that they are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 4-8 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: October 12, 2006

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/RTS/tmk